

REMARKS

The Applicants have carefully considered the Office Action dated July 1, 2010, and the references it cites. Currently, claims 12 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-11, 13, 14, and 16 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejects:

- the IDS filed April 8, 2010;
- all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite;
- claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,639,915 to Tsztoo et al. (*Tsztoo*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,654 to Galdun et al. (*Galdun*) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,847,677 to Schlegel et al. (*Schlegel*); and
- claims 4-5 and 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Tsztoo* in view of *Galdun* and *Schlegel* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,201,789 to Witkowski et al. (*Witkowski*).

In addition, the Examiner objected to the form of claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 and indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the base claim and any intervening claims.

In response, the Applicants submit the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Specifically, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 6. Further, claims 13 and 16 were amended for clarity. The Applicants note that the amendments to the independent claims substantially include the subject matter than the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, the Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.

Further, the Examiner rejects the IDS filed April 8, 2010, as not complying with IDS requirements in that no English translation or English abstract was provided. Applicants note that “where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office.” *See MPEP § 609.04(a)(III)*. Applicants note that the references cited

in the IDS were provided by a Korean Patent Office in a search report and a translation of the search report was provided to the Examiner. Accordingly, the IDS was properly submitted pursuant to U.S. Patent and Trademark Office procedures. The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the cited references and return a copy of the PTO-1449 form.

The Applicant submits that the above amendments and remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action dated July 1, 2010. Further, the Applicant submits that, for at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Simon Booth/
Simon Booth
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 58,582

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.
1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680
(202) 659-9076

Dated: August 31, 2010